

C. DUKES SCOTT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1111 Main Street, Suite 300
Columbia, SC 29201



Main Line: 803 737-0800
Legal Department: 803 737-0877

DAN E ARNETT
CHIEF OF STAFF

FLORENCE P. BELSER
GENERAL COUNSEL

March 25, 2005

The Honorable Charles L.A. Terrini
Chief Clerk/ Administrator
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
Synergy Business Park
101 Executive Center Dr.
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

RE: Docket No. 2004-316-C – Petition of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to Interconnection
Agreements Resulting from Changes of Law

Dear Mr. Terrini:

On March 16, 2005, the Office of Regulatory Staff (ORS) received a letter concerning the above-referenced matter from Jocelyn G. Boyd, Esquire, Deputy Clerk for the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (Commission). By her letter, Ms. Boyd requested all parties who presented substantive arguments at the oral arguments regarding the Motion for Emergency Relief to file proposed orders by close of business on Friday, March 25, 2005, if the parties had not previously filed a proposed order.

After carefully reviewing the transcript from the oral arguments of March 10, 2005, and the proposed order submitted by the Joint Petitioners,¹ ORS concurs in the proposed order filed by the Joint Petitioners with the following exceptions:

- On page 8 of the proposed order in the first line of paragraph 8, ORS submits that the reference to Paragraph 277 of the TRRO should actually be a reference to Paragraph 227.

¹ The Petitioners to the Petition of Emergency Relief are NuVox Communications, Inc.; Xspedius Management Co. of Charleston, LLC; Xspedius Management Co. of Columbia, LLC; Xspedius Management Co. of Greenville, LLC; Xspedius Management Co. of Spartanburg, LLC; KMC Telecom III, LLC; and KMC Telecom V, Inc. and are collectively referenced in the Petition, the proposed order, and this letter as the "Joint Petitioners."


173324
ACCEPTED
Legal 3-28-05

RECORDED
2005 MAR 25 PM 4:43
SO PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

- On page 10 – 11 of the proposed order, ORS takes no position of the discussion of the section concerning “The Effect of the *Abeyance Agreement*.” ORS would note that ORS did not present any argument concerning the effect of the *Abeyance Agreement*, and therefore, ORS does not take a position on the portion of the proposed order dealing with treatment of the Joint Petitioners’ argument concerning the *Abeyance Agreement*.

ORS believes that the proposed order of the Joint Petitioners encompasses the points made by ORS during its oral argument, and ORS concurs with the proposed order of the Joint Petitioners, except as noted above. Accordingly, ORS will not be submitting a separate proposed order in this matter.

Very truly yours,



Florence P. Belser
General Counsel

FPB/cc

cc: all parties of record